

REMARKS

In the Official Action of October 3, 2003, claim 10 was objected to as being an improper dependent claim. Claim 10 has been corrected pursuant to this paper, so that it is now in independent format drawn to a microscope. No new substantive subject matter has been introduced into amended claim 10, other than to make minor grammatical corrections.


Independent Claim 10 and dependent claims 11-21 should now be in condition for allowance.

A minor amendment has been made to claim 1 for purposes of correcting the absence of antecedent basis for "the illumination beam path", first occurrence.

It would appear the informalities highlighted in the Official Action of October 3, 2003 have been obviated, so as to place this application in condition for allowance. Notification of the same at an early date is courteously requested.

January 5, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Howard M. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 25856
(716) 626-1564